The Woman's Protest

Published Monthly by the National Association Opposed to Woman's Suffrage
39 West 39th Street, New York City

Vol. 2
No. 1

NOVEMBER
1912

WOMEN WAGE EARNERS AND THE BALLOT

WOMEN AS CHARACTER BUILDERS

NEW SUFFRAGE VIEWPOINTS IN ENGLAND

WOMAN SUFFAGE AND THE SOCIAL EVIL

ATTITUDE OF CANADIAN WOMEN

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
JAN 23 1913

Subscription, $1.00 a Year

Single Copies, 10 Cents.

Entered as second-class matter May 1, 1912, at the postoffice at New York, New York, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

29 West 39th Street, New York City.

President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, New York.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Henry P. Kidder, Boston, Mass.; Mrs. Horace Brock, Philadelphia, Pa.
Secretary, Mrs. Morgan G. Bulkeley, Hartford, Conn.
Treasurer, Mrs. Robert Garrett, Roland Park, Baltimore, Md.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

Miss Mary S. Ames, Boston, Mass.
Mrs. William A. Putnam, New York.
Mrs. C. F. Corbin, Chicago, Ill.
Mrs. J. F. Bailey, Portland, Oregon.
Mrs. J. Gardner Cassatt, Philadelphia, Pa.
Mrs. Rowland G. Hazard, Peacedale, R. I.
Mrs. Daniel A. Markham, Hartford, Conn.
Mrs. Frank Goodwin, Washington, D. C.
Mrs. Herman M. Hubbard, Columbus, O.
Miss Anna Dayton, Trenton, N. J.
Miss Jane U. Rutherford, Richmond, Va.
Mrs. Edson J. Hill, New Hampshire.

State Associations Opposed fo Woman Suffrage

CONNECTICUT

President, Mrs. Daniel A. Markham.
Vice-Presidents, Miss Elizabeth Burnell, Mrs. Charles C. Beach, Miss Martha J. Wilkinson.
Treasurer, Mrs. Albert S. Cook.
Secretary, Mrs. John L. Bunce, 45 Sumner Street, Hartford.

ILLINOIS

President, Mrs. Caroline F. Corbin.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. R. J. Oglesby, Mrs. James M. Walker, Mrs. T. B. Blackstone.
Treasurer, Miss J. C. Fairfield, Dearborn Avenue, Chicago.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. George W. Kretzinger.

IOWA COMMITTEE.

President, Mrs. Martin Flynn.
Secretary, Mrs. Simon Casady, 715 Prospect Road, Des Moines.

MAINE COMMITTEE.

Secretary, Mrs. Sidney W. Thaxter, Portland; Mrs. Charles S. Ogden, Mrs. James P. Baxter, Mrs. Clarence H. Corning, Mrs. F. A. Quimby, Miss Louisa Spring, Miss Catherine P. Talbot, Miss Hannah L. Talbot, Miss Mary King Longfellow, Miss Elinor S. Moody, Miss Marion Richmond Weeks, Mrs. John M. Glidden, Newcastle; Mrs. P. M. Blake, Bangor; Mrs. F. C. Robinson, Brunswick.

MARYLAND.

President, Mrs. Robert Garrett.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Francis T. Redwood, Mrs. John Haslup Adams, Mrs. Arthur B. Kinsolving, Miss Catharine M. Selfe.
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Katherine R. Davis.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Claude Hall.
Treasurer, Mrs. Charles B. Penrose.

MASSACHUSETTS.

President, Miss Mary S. Ames.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. J. Randolph Coolidge, Miss Anna L. Dawes, Mrs. Charles E. Guild, Mrs. Charles D. Homans, Miss Agnes Irwin, Mrs. Henry M. Whitney.
Treasurer, Mrs. James M. Codman.
Recording Secretary, Miss Elizabeth Johnson.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Charles P. Strong, Room 615 Kensington Building, Boyleston Street, Boston.

NEW HAMPSHIRE ASSOCIATION.

President, Mrs. Edson J. Hill, Concord.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Thomas C. Bethume, Concord; Mrs. Will B. Howe, Concord; Mrs. Barrett Wendell, Portsmouth; Mrs. A. T. Dudley, Exeter; Mrs. John R. Spring, Nashua.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Otis G. Hammond, Concord.
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Grace Morrill, Concord.
Treasurer, Miss Carry R. Todd.

NEW JERSEY.

President, Miss Anna Dayton.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Grover Cleveland, Princeton; Mrs. Thomas Craven, Salem.
Secretary, Miss Fanny Dickinson.
Treasurer, Mrs. Charles Minnegorode, 192 West State Street, Trenton.

NEW YORK STATE.

President, Mrs. William A. Putnam.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge.
Vice-President, Miss Eleanor G. Hewitt, Mrs. Fritz Achelis, Mrs. George Douglas Miller, Mrs. William P. Northrup.
Honorary Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Elihu Root, Mrs. Richard Watson Gilder, Mrs. Francis M. Scott.
Secretary, Mrs. M. E. Loomis, 29 West 39th Street.
Treasurer, Mrs. Charlton T. Lewis.

OHIO.

President, Mrs. Hermon M. Hubbard.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Joseph Crane, Dayton; Mrs. W. W. Clippinger, Madisonville; Mrs. John M. Gundry, Cleveland; Mrs. Helen M. Lucas, Marietta; Mrs. Frank Ray, Granville; Mrs. H. E. Talbott, Dayton.

OREGON.

President, Mrs. Francis J. Bailey, Bower's Hotel, Portland.
Vice-Presidents, Miss Failing, Mrs. R. W. Wilbur.
Treasurer, Mrs. Wallace McCamant.
Secretary, Miss Eleanor E. Gile.

PENNSYLVANIA.

President, Mrs. J. Gardner Cassatt.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Frank Samuel, Mrs. William W. Birdsall, Miss Sophy D. Irwin, Mrs. James Large, Mrs. William L. McLean, Miss Mary Newhall.
Treasurer, Miss Elsie Balch.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Brinton Coxe, 1515 Spruce Street, Philadelphia.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Charles Bingham Penrose.

RHODE ISLAND.

President, Mrs. Rowland G. Hazard, Peacedale.
Treasurer, Mrs. Elisha Howard.
Secretary, Mrs. Albert Harkness.

VIRGINIA.

President, Miss Jane M. Rutherford.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Thomas Cary Johnson, Mrs. Charles Whitlock, Miss Annie Rose Walker, Mrs. Arthur Wilmer.
Secretary, Mrs. Charles M. Ferrell, 1616 Grove Avenue, Richmond.

VERMONT.

President, Mrs. Brooks Brown, Burlington.
Vice-President, Mrs. George W. Wales, Burlington.
Secretary, Mrs. M. H. Buckham, Burlington.
Treasurer, Mrs. Clarence Morgan, Burlington.
Executive Committee, Mrs. G. G. Benedict, Mrs. Addison B. Buell, Mrs. Merritt D. Chittenden, Miss Bertha Terrill, Burlington.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

President, Mrs. Frank Goodwin.
Honorary Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Elihu Root, Miss Jane Riggs, Miss Mollie Eliot Seawell, Mrs. George Wickersham, Miss Grace Denio Litchfield.
Treasurer, Miss McMullen.
Secretary, Mrs. Kingsbury Waterman, 1311 New Hampshire Avenue.

WISCONSIN.

Madison Branch.
President, Mrs. Frank W. Hoyt.
Treasurer, Mrs. Joseph W. Hobbins.
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Genevieve Mills, 222 Monona Avenue, Madison.

Does the American Working Woman Need the ballot to Remedy Wage Earning Conditions?

It is impossible to believe that the sincere women who advocate woman suffrage really understand to what dire results their teachings lead. The cry is everywhere heard that 7,000,000 working women need the ballot to secure better working conditions and to increase their wages; and in the same voice women declare that every woman must be a wage-earner. This is no unfair statement, a mere objection by an anti-suffragist.

"I think most informed and progressive people are agreed as to the necessity of economic independence for the married woman. If the mother is a wage-earner the father's task will be simplified," says Mrs. Mary Ware Dennett, Secretary of the National Woman Suffrage Association.

"The hopelessness of woman's position until she becomes financially independent is the one lesson which all social settlement workers sooner or later learn," says the Rev. Anna Shaw, and in a later paragraph, in the same plea for woman suffrage, it is apparent that all women must become financially independent.

Young girls are everywhere urged to become "financially independent." There is scarcely a college girl in America who is not fitting herself for some profession. "Financial independence" is the ideal condition for women. All suffragists declare it. There are 7,000,000 working women in America, and the suffragist teaching is that all other women should be added to their number. The suffragist who wrote lately to an anti-suffragist publication, demanding to know what State "has ever enacted the law of supply and demand you speak of" is no real representative of the woman suffrage party. Many suffragists are trained economists who understand that supply and demand naturally regulate wages. Because of this law, labor unions have sprung into being. Workmen are many. The employer will take the man who offers his work cheapest, and in order that the unmarried man, who needs less money may not be underpaid, the man who supports a family, intelligent labor organized. The vote cannot raise wages, and working men know it. They must stand together, abolish underbidding, and strike together when wages are lowered. Even some men in labor unions do not understand how necessary the union is. They object to limited hours, but the wish of the minority must never rule the majority. Working men fare best in trades where unions are strongest. And the best paid workers belong to trades in which they are not obliged to compete with women.

Of the 7,000,000 working women it is impossible to say how many are entirely self-supporting. But the investigation of the condition of working girls in Baltimore showed that many of them had homes and only partially supported themselves, and this was pointed out as one of the chief factors in the causation of wages. Yet suffragists propose to raise the wages of working women, and at the same time to add to their number more girls who can afford to work for less than a living wage.

The National Women's Trade Union League of America says this, and says it emphatically:

"Unorganized, badly-paid women workers lower men's wages."

And of our working women only twenty per cent. are in factories. Their work requires little skill, and many of them are under age. Most of them are forced by dire necessity to compete with men, but in every factory town is found the girl who can afford to underbid. Organization of unskilled labor, and of working girls under age, is well-nigh impossible. The unions can do little to protect these girl workers. The majority of working women are not in trade unions. Forty per cent. of them are servants or farm laborers. The rest are engaged in occupations in which no union protects them, and because these occupations are considered higher in the social scale, the pin money woman is the more prevalent in them. Even if all these occupations were unionized she would be quite as great a detriment to the girl or woman who earns her living. A number of the Bookkeepers', Stenographers' and Accounts' Union, in "Life and Labor," urging the necessity of enlarging the union, writes: "Why Are Salaries Going Down? You surely have noticed that a younger element is more and more crowding in, who, because of inexperience and inefficiency, and mostly because of financial pressure, accept the most paltry wages. What follows as a natural consequence? So that those really experienced and qualified stenographers and clerks have a hard fight getting even twelve dollars."

Not two weeks ago a stenographer in New York, whose pay was fifteen dollars a week, was replaced by a college-girl, who receives the same pay. Because she wanted to be "financially independent" this girl, whose father paid her way through college, and a business-college, has gone to work.

"She can afford to dress better than I can," the girl whose place she has taken says, "and, of course, neatness and trimness count for a great deal in an office. You can't be tailor-made and manicured when fifteen dollars a week is all you have to live on."

If stenographers must fight hard to get twelve dollars a week, in Heaven's name why should a young suffragist, fired with an ambition merely to prove that she can earn a living, because seh is taught that dependence shows a lack of self-respect, take the living away from a girl who isn't college bred and tailored and manicured?

Teachers are organized. but union rules do not prevail. There is only one large city in the country where women's wages have been made equal with men's without lowering any man teacher's salary. In Chicago equal pay and equal opportunity were not obtained by the teachers' organization. The pin-money woman had never been suppressed. Increase in pay came as a surprise to teachers. It was made possible by cutting out all waste of school funds and by obtaining additional appropriations. The man who inaugurated that retrenchment policy received, as President of the Board of Education, protests from many woman's clubs in Chicago. They held that he was opposing the city beautiful movement when he proposed to build school-

(*Continued on Page* 5)

The Woman's Protest

Published Monthly by

The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

29 West 39th Street, New York City

President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge - - - - - - New York
Secretary, Mrs. Morgan G. Bulkeley - - - Hartford, Conn.
Treasurer, Mrs. Robert Garrett - Roland Park, Baltimore

VOL. II. NOVEMBER, 1912, No. 1

The Woman's Protest invites letters from its readers

EQUAL SUFFRAGE AND EQUAL OBLIGATION.

MUCH has been written by Suffragists on the subject of women who support their husbands, and should, because of that fact, be granted equal suffrage. Equal suffrage means equal obligations and equal responsibilities, and no privileges. If it does not mean this, the suffrage cry is for woman suffrage and the retention of woman's privileges.

At present the law requires that every man support his wife and children. No woman is required by law to support her husband. A woman with a private fortune may announce that home and children bore her, and with no other reason desert her husband and babies. No matter how poor the man is, no matter what injury or illness have robbed him of his wage-earning capacity, she is not bound to support him. Husband desertion is no offense in the sight of the law.

On the other hand, a husband is under a legal obligation to support his wife. She does not receive his bounty nor his charity. The law recognizes that her services are valuable; that by marriage she surrenders her opportunity to be self-supporting; surrenders, too, her opportunity of marrying to greater advantage. The woman whose husband cannot or will not support her is entitled to a divorce in almost all of the States. These laws were made for the protection of women, by men, with full recognition of the faults and failings of the occasional husband and father. Because worthless men may, and do, desert their families, all men are bound by the same law, for the general good.

Many women are not supported by their husbands, and many do man's work. To the average man, to every man except the brute, invalidism or financial failure is made doubly bitter by the thought that his wife must needs support him. The wife who does do a man's work to support a sick husband is glad that she is not bound by law to do so. The hardship is a sacred privilege to her. Suffragists say their cry is for equal suffrage. It is a cruel cry. They wish to deprive women, as a whole, of their legal advantages, and place their all in the unfortunate situation into which the exceptional selfishness—for which the law gives redress—or illness of some men has thrown a few.

Many Suffragists point with pride to the fact that their husbands no longer support them. To these women of perfect health and great prowess that may be a proud boast. They need not clamor for the privilege. No law prohibits their exercising it to the full, but they must not deprive the busy home-loving woman, the poor woman whose children are many, or the frail invalid of the right which men's laws have bestowed on her because of her well recognized disadvantageous position as a wage-earner.

It is, indeed, the cry of many women, spoiled by luxury and idleness, that they long for actual hardship, actual struggles and are sick of being cared for, but that is the most selfish of all excuses for depriving heavily burdened women of their valuable legal privileges.

All good women who love their sex and feel loving kindness toward the unfortunate should stand hand in hand with their husbands against such pitiless equal suffrage.

These arguments were presented to a well known suffragist, and she remarked that men would certainly support their wives "in any case." It was "their interest to do so." The lady's cheerful optimism is not borne out by experience. Wives are still commonly sold or "swapped" in the isolated mountain districts of some of our Southern States, where it might profit some Suffragists to open a school to teach women's rights before teaching woman suffrage. But the optimistic Suffragist is right in this that every man will always support some woman. The order of society is better served, however, by knowing which woman and for how long, and by not leaving such things to chance or fate or occasional conscience to decide.

No pressure will be brought to bear on women to retain advantages which are irksome and humiliating to their dignity as emancipated human beings. No Suffragist is constrained to accept the dependence she scorns. Let her renounce support and dower if she pleases. No law requires her to live with a rich husband who represents "a social tyranny which slowly and surely blight her womanhood, warping her individuality, withering her soul, stunting her intelligence and making her useless to herself and to humanity, for which she had a brooding tenderness" (to quote an ardent account of a prominent suffragist).

Let every suffragist have the independence she clamors for. It is hers to take if she please. But she must not tamper with the vested rights of less fortunate women.

CANADIAN WOMEN AND SUFFRAGE.

"NEARLY nine-tenths of the women of Montreal, Canada, are emphatically opposed to the suffrage movement," says the Montreal "Star," of October 12, following a representative canvass, in which all classes were given an opportunity to express their opinions. Many of the women who were interviewed did not hesitate to use some very outspoken language. All were incensed at the idea of an English woman from an "old country" going to Canada and pretending to tell the Canadian women what they should do. They look upon it as a piece of impertinence, for, as one woman remarked, "we women of Canada are quite able and competent to look after ourselves without anybody coming here to teach us what to do."

Several amusing incidents were recited by the man from the "Star." At one house he asked three charming young women if they were in favor of woman suffrage! they stared blankly at the interviewer, broke into laughter, and remarked to each other. "He's mad." At the home of a St. Hubert matron, where several young women were present, the sentiment expressed was, "we are just women and that's all—suffragettes are really half men and half women." The most generally voiced opinion was, "Not for me, thank you; I'm too busy with more important affairs."

The average percentage shown as a result of the "Star's" straw ballot was 11.8 per cent. for and 88.2 per cent against.

(*Continued from Page 3*)

houses all of one architecturally sound plan, wtih simple and good lines and no unnecessary decoration. Though he had chosen a woman to the high position of superintendent of schools, the yellowest newspaper, which supports woman suffrage, assailed him most vilely. He remains, a member of the board, and the policy he inaugurated goes on. Men, attracted by the higher pay offered, seek positions in the Chicago schools in increasing numbers. Women have still to struggle against the impermancy due to possibility of marriage—a factor in causation of wages which cannot be eliminated. Must their struggle be made the harder by the highly educated pin-money woman?

Why is an instructor at the University of Wisconsin struggling to support himself and his wife on sixty dollars a month? Is there not in that same University a young woman instructor who is not obliged to earn her living? Is there only one such young woman there?

Journalism is the trade in which women are most nearly equal with men. Space rates are conditioned entirely on merit. In its higher branches it is a trade a woman can follow without leaving her home. No woman now writes such political editorials as Mrs. Margaret Sullivan wrote. Mrs. Ella Peattie wrote many an able editorial and book review in Omaha when her children were very young. It is active pawspaper work, the outside-the-home work suffragists advocate, that women are at greatest disadvantage, and it is in that work that women can and do underbid other women most. If I may be personal, I obtained a position as reporter on a newspaper in a Northwestern city when I was eighteen. My father had trained me in the trade for four years, and commanded me to do a man's work, and so have just claim to a man's pay. "Sob-squads" were unknown in those days, and the Woman's Page idea in its infancy. Reporting conventions, court trials, Supreme Court decisions, public affairs of all sorts, reviewing books and criticising plays were all matters of the day's work. In emergency a woman reporter was sent to "do" baseball games and amateur sports, or to the morgue to work up a suicide story. One woman reporter could, and did, support herself and a child on her salary. Mine was the same. I went to Washington two years later as what is called a "telegraphic" correspondent, a position no woman had ever occupied before. No woman reporter in that Northwestern city, grown much larger and more expensive to live in, received now as much as women reporters were paid twenty years ago. A girl who wanted "experience" wanted to see what a working girl's life is, came into the field one year, and was willing to work for very little. Two winter's ago a young woman reporter in that city was trying to keep body and soul and honor together on seven dollars a week.

The number of women who can gain entrance to the new School of Journalism at Columbia University is small. Among the women who have gained admission is a married woman who has already studied law. She does not intend to earn her living at newspaper work. An enthusiastic suffragist commends her, because "she has given up society to devote herself to this course." She "may write," but she is studying chiefly to "broaden her outlook."

Why cannot the sincere women suffragists who speak in public see the enormous injury they are doing the working girl, the working man, the working woman, by urging that every woman be a wage earner, and man's industrial equal? There are already too many women forced to work. The common cry of the intelligent working man is, "Give me wages enough to support my family." If the wage to be determined by the need of the individual, not by the need of the man who supports a family?

It is enough that woman suffragists should preach the dangerous doctrine that no woman need feel obliged to vote, since no man votes unless he wants to. Preaching that women secured the franchise in California by two thousand fewer votes than Bryan received when he lost California by nearly 90,000 votes. Preaching that, woman suffragists drew out in Ohio only a little more than half the electorate to vote, not on woman suffrage alone, but on forty other amendments—some of them wholly mad—to the fundamental law of the State. Woman Suffrage was defeated overwhelmingly in Ohio, but the effect of suffragist teaching, humiliates every Anti-Suffragist. The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage flies no flag but the American flag. It is the flag under which the sailors and marines, who lately marched through the streets of New York with all the city cheering and all their way decorated with the flag they defend. Sailors and marines, American citizens who do not vote, like women, serve their country best outside politics. It is the flag of liberty. Every honest American is humiliated that government by the people should be defeated by light voting. And because woman suffragists believe the ballot a men's toy to be used at pleasure, Anti-Suffragists are sending out broadcast an appeal to voters declaring that men must vote if we are not to be ruled by the minority. "The man who will not use the ballot would be afraid to use the bullet for his country," the anti-suffragists say. Appeals must be sent to the women of Colorado where women once cast fifty-two per cent. of the total vote. The mayor and ex-mayor, the chief-of-police and the former chief-of-police have been indicted in Denver for permitting unspeakable vice conditions to exist, and Colorado is controlled by the machine and the interests, because "no woman is ever obliged to vote. No man votes unless he feels like it."

Every economist knows that votes cannot raise wages, but every economist and every working girl and every member of every labor union in the world knows what it means when women of means are urged to compete with men and women who must live on the wages they receive.

Why do the suffragists—who undoubtedly mean well, and are perfectly sincere in their belief that the vote will raise wages, fail to see what their plea for the vote, because there are 7,000,000 working women in America, really means?

It is because so very few of them know what earning a living means. How many of them have ever had to face the world, penniless, with neither father nor husband to fall back on? Not Mrs. Belmont, surely not Jane Addams, not Chrystal Eastman Benedict, not Inez Mulholland, not the Rev. Anna Shaw, not Fola La Follette. They know the working woman as they have studied her. They know her as the scientist knows the brain under his microscope. They have not thought with her brain, nor ached with her heart. They have never felt the sick terror the mother of a little child feels when she comes to spend her last dollar. They have never known the hideous fear of the world that makes a working girl tremble when she is discharged to give room to a girl who wants to be "financially independent."

The woman who, like the Rev. Anna Shaw, honestly believes that the State can assume the duties and responsibilities of the mother, cannot understand how the mother feels. The woman who, like Mrs. Belmont, has been able to hire the best of nurses and tutors for her children, cannot understand what giving up children, to even the best institution, means to the mother whose lack of money has kept her with her children every day and every night. And if mothers must be wage-earners there must be children cared for by the State, or no children at all.

Let the advocates of woman suffrage open their eyes wider and look deeper into the heart of the world. Surely, if they do that they will not strike such a blow at all working women and working men as they strike when they urge all

women to compete with them. They will subject the nation to the rule of the minority, as they do now when they teach both men and women that the franchise is a mere privilege to be exercised at pleasure, and that the ballot is toy—not the peaceful equivalent of the bullet in defense of liberty.

G.

Woman Suffrage Is Not A Panacea for Social Evil

(Paper read by Mrs. Charles H. Parshall before the Otsego Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution at Otsego, N. Y.)

Madam Regent, Ladies: We are in an age of change and unrest. New ideas, theories, inventions and discoveries follow one another in bewildering confusion. There seems no limit to our activities. The spirit of the time has even invaded our governments, for Socialism, with all of its alarming changes is, indeed, a factor in world politics to-day. And yet another movement is before us, far-reaching, for it already extends from New Zealand to Colorado, and concerns itself with more than half the population of the globe—I refer to the enfranchisement of women.

Since the beginning of time there have always been leaders who have formed opinions for the masses. In our country to-day there are two, whom you will agree, are representative of the highest type of American womanhood; the one a scholar and philanthropist, giving her life in humble service to her fellowmen; the other a distinguished author of international repute, devoting her time and means to uplift fallen women—Jane Adams and Margaret Deland—the one an ardent advocate of woman's suffrage; the other thoughtfully questioning the wisdom of it. When women of this type fail to agree, the case is not a clear one for the masses.

The primitive man and woman undoubtedly lived in a state of equality—alike in physique, each mind undeveloped. Side by side they labored for food, clothing and shelter for themselves and offspring. But as soon as there was even a rude form of government—that of the clan and and tribe—the male became the ruling power. There seems to have been no strife over it, it was a division of labor agreeable to both. But the questions of war and government developed the mind of man along new lines and there came on the stage philosophers, poets, historians, statesmen and they were always men. More and more the woman's interests were centered on her family and home. She, too, was developing, but along different lines, and, remember, lines she had chosen for herself. And, if, to-day, she is without a share in the government, is she not a logical result of past centuries?

It is easy to understand how woman became the property of man. He did her thinking and planning for her, and laws were made putting her welfare in his hands. He not only cared for her, but she gradually became of a privileged class, for during the Middle Ages, the curious institution of chivalry arose. It pertained to the system of knighthood, you remember, it developed noble, manly qualities in men and exalted women to a marked degree.

And the spirit of chivalry has never died. The world stood dumb in admiration before the splendid heroism of the men of the Titanic—those of high degree who stood aside that peasant women might have places of safety. "Women first" was the cry that awful night, but would it have been if for centuries they had been equal? Can any fair-minded woman demand equality and at the same time accept the privileges extended to her sex?

But you will say much of this is ancient history. Probably it is, but men and women to-day have the same tastes and desires they had hundreds of years ago. However, in the latter part of the last century, a movement was organized in the United States to give woman a voice in the government. "Woman's Rights" it was popularly called. Here was a fallacy at the start—the ballot is not a right—the only rights secured by the constitution are "life, liberty and pursuit of happiness." The franchise is a privilege conferred necessary to the successful conduct of the government.

There became enlisted in the cause of Woman's Suffrage in its early days a famous triumvirate—Susan B. Anthony, Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Julia Ward Howe—women whose influence would give weight and dignity to any cause they might espouse.

And there are few logical arguments against woman's suffrage, while there are very many for it. Taxation without representation is tyranny; a government gains its just powers from the consent of the governed. These truths are older than the constitution itself. The women who work out in the world among men, as a rule, wish the ballot—they feel it would be a protection—much as a gun in the corner would be a power in case a tramp should invade the home.

And the cause has grown. Woman's suffrage in some form is practised in twenty countries and provinces. In the United States to-day full suffrage prevails in six States; Wyoming, Colorado, Washington, Utah, Idaho and California. This fall more than 1,000,000 women may vote for President.

In New York State women have municipal suffrage. They may vote on questions of taxation and school matters with the same qualifications as men. They cannot vote for legislative, executive or judicial offices. The Suffragists have much to say of the "man-made laws" under which we're living. What are some of them? The wife holds her property absolutely, the husband cannot alienate her dower right in his life time or by his will, while a woman may will every cent away from her husband if she wishes to do so. A wife has the right to the money she earns—her husband or children have no legal claim upon it. A man is responsible for all the just debts of his family. You may sue the husband for his and his wife's debts—you can't sue the wife for her husband's debts. Judgment may be obtained against a man for his wife's wrong-doings, he is responsible for her contracts, in fact, for pretty nearly everything she wishes to do. If woman had had a hand in making these laws could she have done a better job for herself?

But what is the result in the four States where suffrage has longest been in force? Julia Ward Howe circulated letters among the clergymen and editors of these States and received in reply a strong endorsement of the practice. However, you will acknowledge that most of these States are crude and sparsely settled, conditions very unlike those prevailing in the East. The ballot was a modern improvement to attract women there. Wyoming is made up of cattle rangers and cowboys. The Mormon Church has always State in which women are in the majority, has voted steadily for polygamists and law-breakers and sent them to Congress. Idaho is influenced by Mormonism and labor riots are of frequent occurrence there. In the First Congressional District of Colorado, containing the city of Denver, in 1904 occurred the Bonynge-Shafroth controversy. The election had been given to Shafroth, but was contested. The ballot boxes were taken to Washington and opened in the House of Representatives. The corruption was equal to that

of the old reconstruction days in the South. Out of 9,000 ballots, 6,000 were fraudulent. It was shown that the bogus ballots were written by four persons, and one of them was a woman. In all the disclosures the women were well represented. Mr. Shafroth arose in the House and formally resigned his seat. Even if the clergymen and editors in these States endorse the ballot for women, do these illustrations show that she has purified it greatly?

Since having this paper in mind, I've asked about fifty women if they wished to vote. Eighty per cent. of the replies were like this: "Now, I suppose you do, but I don't care anything about it." These women were from all classes, college bred and uneducated, wage-earners and servants, housekeepers and women of leisure. One bright young woman, who has cared for herself since she was 12 years old, and is now holding a responsible position, said: "I don't care to vote, nor have I ever seen a time when I thought the ballot would help me."

And this is the status of the whole matter—the masses of women do not care to vote. The rank and file are not interested in politics or government questions. They are, indeed, logical developments of past ages. If they do not care for the ballot, how lightly would they esteem it! We are too many of that class now! It is quality rather than quantity that we want. We need restriction rather than extension, we need an educational qualification and then extension, regardless of sex lines. The suffragist cry: "All of us or none of us," is founded on shifting sands, for in the spirit of St. Paul, all things that are lawful are not expedient.

And finally, by permission of Hamlet: To vote or not to vote—that is the question. Whether 'tis nobler in the mind to suffer the slings and arrows of "man-made laws," or to take the ballot and by opposing, end them. To vote—to reform—and by our reforms to end the strifes of government—'tis a consummation devoutly to be wished. But to vote—to reform—to make men better than they wish to be—ay, there's the rub, for in those reforms the troubles we'd get into—must give us pause "And make us rather bear those ills we have than fly to others that we know not of."

Registration of Women in California

The newspapers throw certain entertaining side-lights on the women voters in California. Either Col. John P. Irish's statement, based on knowledge, that the franchise was desired by a small minority of California women must be accepted, or credence must be given to the delicately expressed remark of Mrs. Gertrude Atherton, so bitterly resented by Miss Alice Carpenter, another suffragist, that there are a few hundred intelligent women and several million fools (presumably all suffragists) in America.

In Oakland, says the "San Francisco Chronicle," "Women of all kinds and descriptions, young, old and indifferent, thronged the office of County Clerk John P. Cook to-day and registered. More women were registered to-day than have been enrolled in any other one day since the registration department was opened. The reason for the invasion of the registration department is that the recently enacted State law providing that women do not have to make known their ages went into effect to-day.

"Do we have to tell our ages?" was the invariable first question which the fair suffragettes put to the over-worked registration clerks throughout the day. When informed that such a confession was not necessary expressions of joy prevailed and the registration went on merrily.

The majority of those registered to-day were of what might be called indifferent ages. They were not young, they were not old, and very nearly all of them were unmarried. They confessed that they had long desired to be registered as voters, but that they "Held off" until the new law should go into effect.

The difficulty of getting out the whole vote in San Francisco is made very clear in a later news paragraph. According to the "Chronicle" a registration campaign was instituted by the San Francisco Center of the Civic League. Cards were sent out to its nine hundred members and they responded nobly. They came out to guard registration booths, and, continues the "Chronicle," "about ninety per cent. of the registration done at the various places is brought in during the hours when volunteer workers are doing duty at such places by approaching pedestrians and making a personal appeal for registration."

Evidently the women found it tiresome to work all day, and "personal appeal" is everywhere effective. The "Chronicle" says: "A curious insight into the understanding of the new voters on the subject of registration is gained from the assortment of questions asked of the women pickets.

Women who have been dodging registration booths and the outlying pickets have admitted that they believed a tax, similar to the poll tax, is assessed the voter on registering. Others have inquired whether or not by registering a voter lays herself liable to a criminal action in case the primary or the election comes while the housewife is in the midst of pressing domestic duties and finds it impossible to go to the polls."

Suffragists have continually preached that voting will not interfere with domestic duties, but it appears that women who have real domestic duties to perform do not agree with them. That these housewives should believe that exercise is compulsory—so much a duty that failure to vote is an offense against the law, and not merely "permission," is very greatly to their credit. It is possible that some of them are from the cantons of Switzerland, where a very severe penalty attaches to failure to vote. It is the opinion of the Attorney General of the United States that the Swiss law, in its essential provisions, should be enacted in this country.

Even as to the "personal appeal" of volunteer suffragette political workers, not all Californians are agreed. The "San Francisco Examiner" says: "Considerable difference of opinion has already been expressed as to the wisdom of forced registration, and as to the benefit of the forced vote that will result. While the ardent workers in the registration field during the past weeks believe that calling the attention to the duty of registration was the only thing necessary to start evolution toward good citizenship, there are others who have expressed the opinion that a woman whose consciousness of her citizenship was only awakened atfer being stopped on the street by a stranger, given a quick lesson in the art of registering, and then, in many cases, subjected to a course of persuasion almost equivalent to being blindfolded and backed into the nearest booth, is hardly one from whom much benefit to the world could be expected to proceed, and that she, therefore, should have been permitted to evolve according to the processes of her own nature. To substantiate this view, the confessions of the women thus forced to register have been extensively quoted, showing on their part a civic consciousness that was subject to influence from everything from a husband to the season for putting up jam.

Frank admissions that the coming vote would be according to the opinion of the husband were frequently made, and a particularly interesting case of qualified citizenship was that of the woman who said she hoped the time to vote would not arrive until after the fruit season, as otherwise she could not leave her preserves to go to the polls. The

working girl appears to be too busy earning her living to have made a marked impression on registration returns, and the society girl appears to have been too much occupied in spending hers to give attention to the same matter. Others objecting to forced registration have seemed to be of the opinion that a woman should be permitted to walk the streets without being stopped and reminded of her duty by another woman, such others holding that the recognition of duty represents a decision that should be left to each individual.

The late promoters of citizenship, however, believe that the booth runner and quick-education process was merely to start something that individual conscience and personal progress will finish in due season to give to the San Francisco returns at the next election the benefit of the ineffable feminine touch.

And in the meantime those lately volunteering services as pickets, scouts and runners are receiving the congratulations of the suffragists of the entire country on the faithful performance of duty as duty was understood.

The San Francisco Center of the California Civic League has announced that all amendments to come before the public at the next election will be discussed by the center in open meeting in time to enlighten the voters as to their advantages. The first amendment to be thus considered will be that relating to free text books, and the discussion will take place this month at a time and place to be announced later."

The Civic League appears to be greatly behind the times. One of the earliest protests against the use of free books came from a California mother, whose child suffered an attack of scarlet fever, directly traceable to the use of an infected school book. Other intelligent persons in other States, including the highest medical authorities, object to the use of free text books, unless each book is most thoroughly sterilized before it passes from one child to another.

However, it cannot be held that woman suffrage is a failure in California. It has accomplished one thing which has never been accomplished in the male-suffragist States. A woman Socialist was elected judge out there, "according to the press," and after election failed to pass her examinations for admission to the bar. If she manages to pass them before she assumes her duties, her decisions will certainly be governed by no man-made precedent, no warping experience as a lawyer, no unwritten law, and persons appearing before her will have every benefit of that universal brotherhood teaching of Socialists.

INDIRECT INFLUENCE

One of the most fallacious arguments used by the Suffragists is that indirect influence will be at an end once women get into politics. It seems incredible that such an idea could have persisted so long, and shows the superficial quality of the thinking (?) which is applied to this subject. Politics is, of course, the pre-eminent opportunity for indirect influence, and, indeed, personal influence, directly or indirectly applied, is absolutely necessary for political success. A candidate for office does not, as a rule, remove his personality from the scene of action the moment he has cast his vote. Prince Bismarck, a believer in Woman Suffrage, gave as the ground of his belief that women were so "sly" that there were many times when they could easily (by the use of a little indirect influence) extract secrets of state which men could not by any means arrive at. He foresaw their possibilities in a secondary position, as political jackals, and apparently was not unwilling to make use of their services. Prince Bismarck was, as most great politicians are, a past master in the art of indirect influence. It is, indeed, part of the professional baggage of a politician and even the greatest statesmen profit by the uses of diplomacy, in which women are natural adepts.

The Suffragists are naive, indeed, if they imagine that casting a bit of paper in a ballot box will alter other women's desire to please men, or that depending on popular favor will make her less given to the use of indirect influence. How any one who had ever watched the course of a Presidential candidate, kissing the babies, complimenting local conditions, flattering the women voters and giving sops to corporations, could cherish such an illusion it is difficult to see. Woman in politics will have many more reasons for using her arts of pleasing, just because she will have many more people to please and her kaleidoscopic qualities will become more and more highly developed with practice as she discovers that charm is her strongest weapon. That, in accordance with her woman's nature, these qualities will be generally used in behalf of men, I think most likely.

The Duchess of Denvonshire, kissing a butcher to get a vote for her husband, is the subject of a famous picture, still she might as well be kissing the butcher to get a vote herself, and thus the purpose, direction and use of her indirect influence may essentially alter.

It seems desirable to the Suffragette to root out all that represents the special characteristics or creation of woman and to remodel the whole of life on masculine standards. This means, of course, destroying the kingdom of women and making them slaves. I cannot imagine a more pathetic figure than a woman politician out of office, wheedling and begging for votes, both from women and men, unless it is the same woman stumping the country and being slapped on the back and called by her first name by saloonkeepers and party bosses. Sex is to be "eliminated." No privileges or exemptions are desired. There is, therefore, no reasonable ground that that female politician can take, which will prevent familiarities, and though consciously or unconsciously, she will doubtless continue to make the sex appeal to the protection and chivalry of men, the appeal will have less and less weight as it comes from the lips of women who are attacking publicly the interests and characters of the men on whom they depend for protection. Does any one think the wisest women will be tempted by these careers? Or that a life of struggle, invective and indirect influence will offer an inducement to the best class of women? Although many women can, and do wield a great and most beneficial political influence in London drawing rooms and Paris salons through their intelligent sympathy and profound interest in public affairs, and though women of the lower classes in our country are learning what they have long known elsewhere that moderate prices are at the cost of "eternal vigilance," yet most honest women here, as there, feel that running for office is a distinct interference with woman's various valuable functions to society. The women who have best understood political economy have been the first to realize this, and among Anti-Suffragists are such names as Queen Victoria, Hannah More, Caroline Norton, Mrs. Humphrey Ward, Mrs. Margaret Deland, Mrs. Grover Cleveland and Ida Tarbell—all women who were accustomed to the society and friendship of great statesmen—statesmen who, no doubt, Mrs. Pankhurst and her band would have slapped in the face had they stood valiantly for woman's suffrage and Utah, the only happened to differ with them.

At present the idea that the millenium is about to dawn has taken possession of the Idealists, and the Doctrinaires are abroad in the land preaching almost in the language of Rousseau, a perfect state built on the theories of the Contrat Social. Visions such as these have commonly foretold "red ruin and the breaking up of homes." J. G. W.

Objects to Equal Suffrage

The suffragette has been quick to seize upon the disadvantageousness of man's position, and so force him into an alliance with herself. Man against man is an equal contest, but man against woman places him at a disadvantage.

Had votes for women been in the slightest degree needful for her interests, men would voluntarily have placed them in her hands.

No women have the property privileges of the American women. A woman's property is as much protected as man's, and if her rights are infringed she has the same redress. In many States, man is responsible for any debts owed by the wife before marriage, and certainly for all contracted after. The wife is not responsible for her husband's debts at any time. The wife is sole possessor of her own estate, the husband is not. It is absurd for women in America to ask the vote. Were they needed, women would not have to place themselves in such ridiculous positions, as the suffragettes are constantly doing. To stand in an automobile, pathetically bewailing woman's wrongs to a crowd of bystanders, is as ludicrous as it is silly.

It has never ceased to be a source of wonderment, why the Anti-Suffragette should be considered so lacking in intelligence that she cannot judge as well as her suffragette sister, what is best for women' needs. One wonders what the suffragette has done to expand her brain to greater dimensions than that of her anti-sister.

The Anti-Suffragette believes man as capable of caring for and as interested in the child labor problem as any woman. She believes the principles of right living more thoroughly and peristently taught, would render unnecessary any laws relative to child labor. She believes that if greater interest were taken in the art of good cooking, less pure food laws would be needed; and also believes that if man does not know the exact amount of wool in his child's underwear, as we are told by a suffragette he does not, he is still competent to vote upon the tariff.

The Anti-Suffragette does not question woman's ability to vote, cut the grass, carry the coal or perform any man's work she chooses, but why the desire to assume such unbecoming offices. Manly honors held by a woman deteriorate her. The wife of a governor holds a position of which she may be justly proud, but the woman who holds the office herself becomes simply a medium through which the work is done. The suffragette does not see this, because she has no ideal woman picture in her mind, with aspirations to approach it as nearly as possible. She envies man and aspires only to championship in his pursuits. She laughs and turns aside, when anything is said unfavorable to her cause, and treats all ridicule as persecution rather than justifiable criticism, and regards herself as a twentieth century martyr. She considers that the Anti-Suffragette is not progressive, that she is old-fashioned and will have to get used to her political sisters' orations and discourses, upon questions of tariff and Presidential nominees.

We can get used to it. Certainly! We are used to the bill boards that adorn our vacant lots, but we have never come to admire them, or cease to wish them elsewhere. We may be old-fashioned and unprogressive, because we object to the suffragettes placing young girls on the streets or elsewhere, as advertisements for votes for women, but it is an old-fashionedness we hope always to retain.

When the man suffragette says he wants "Votes for Women," but would not trust a woman, it looks very much as if he wanted votes from women, and not for women.

Men suffragettes are divided into three classes, those who have reached the one-foot-in-the-grave stage and are not concerned in what comes after the other foot, has seconded the motion; those who hate work, either mental or physical, and are willing to have women relieve them of all responsibility, and those who have political aspirations, but whose strength of character is not great enough to impress men, and are willing to gain the coveted office by votes from women. There is a residue not classed with the legitimates, who belong because they did not know how to refuse. Through some information gained from a leading magazine, it would seem that in States where women have the vote the worst men are sent to Congress. From the popularity some weak-minded men have with women, we can readily see how this would often be the case. Utah, the Mormon State, has a majority of women voters, and we do not see any very radical changes in the government. Laws may have been passed, but, apparently receive little attention.

We want "Recognition" is the cry of the suffragette. She cannot be content with that which comes to her through husband and children. She cannot be content to let husband or some man properly situated represent her. She wants to appear in person, and her views must take precedence over man's, and then she feels that she is recognized. She knows so much better than man how to run a business or factory where women are employed that one cannot help wondering why it is she has never been able to handle the problem of domestic help; she spends much of her time telling of the down-trodden condition of the working girl in the employ of man. Yet the girl who works would rather do so in the worst ill-ventilated factory, mill or laundry than do woman's work for a woman. When all women, instead of just a few will cultivate a greater love for and interest in their homes the domestic problem will be easier of solution.—Emma Louise Street, Morning Journal-Courier.

New Haven, Conn., Oct. 15, 1912.

Should a Mother's Political Work Begin With Her Son?

The following letter was writen to an Englishman of nearly eighty years old, who has a large farm in Wisconsin, where he has lived since early manhood. When in England he wrote to the writer of this letter in regard to the actions of the Suffragists there, and asked her opinion of Woman Suffrage:

"One argument of the suffragists—a double-barreled one—is that men are so corrupt that it is hopeless to expect clean politics or righteous legislation from them; and that women are so inherently high-minded that they will perforce change the present state of affairs that smells to heaven.

"Promptly acknowledging the evils and corruption that make one blush for the honor of our country, one is, even at the same moment, confronted with this question: If women are such pure, wise, firm and upright counselors and rulers that simply their womanhood guarantees that the reins of government must be put in their hands to save the State, whence came this race of corrupt, unscrupulous, villainous men in whose hands the country is going to the 'demnition bow-wows' headlong, and to whom no righteous movement can appeal? How did they happen? Women reared them, nurtured them in their impressionable years when they were as clay in the hands of the potter.

"At the knees of women they SHOULD have learned the lessons of true manhood, the fear of God and the beginning of wisdom, which would have fitted them to guide the Ship of State aright. Or were those mothers so busy attending women's right clubs, and missionary meetings, and agonizing over the heathen, that they had no time to train up noble men as a gift to their country, hence a crop of 'slick' and oily and conscienceless politicians arose?

"I have seen so many fool mothers raising liars and other 'undesirables,' as Teddy has it, to recruit the next generation of political money-changers and parasites to prey upon the land, that I will wait a long time before I say that these same women, who can't (or won't) train infant souls given into their hands like wax, to receive the impress of their individuality, are fit to rule a nation.

"Furthermore, when the coming crop of politicians get to work at the business of playing fast and loose with the laws of their beloved country, and, incidentally, lining their pockets with the proceeds, I DON'T think these same women who reared them in such fashion will be the ones best qualified to step in and save the country; I think it will take an army of angels to do that. This 'purifying' influence that woman will surely exert in politics, if she takes a hand in it, is all rot; why, every sewing-circle and card-club and church choir gives women a chance to show they are just as full of trickery and treachery and double-dealing as the same number of men would be. Integrity of character is not a matter of sex. A good woman is God's noblest handiwork, even more than a good man, for she may be the mother of a race of noble men; one speaks of her with reverence; but somehow the reverence dies out if she pictures her squabbling for the ballot, or breaking windows. I don't see for the life of me how she elevates herself that way.

"And, further: I can't see, if women are going to clean house in all the branches of the government just as quick as they get the chance, why they haven't rectified a thousand abuses that are a blot on the land, and do not need the vote to rectify; I will not enumerate, think them out for yourself; they are free to do this; no one is holding them; these things would keep them sufficiently busy.

"They aren't denied the ballot for if they ALL wanted it they would have had it long ago; doesn't woman get everything she wants if she goes at man right? He can't help himself. So I don't feel mad about it because I can't vote; politics is not government, strictly speaking; under our beautiful system it is one of two things; either a cold business proposition, with the emoluments for sale for hard cash; or a fascinating and absorbing game, often involving risky chances and sometimes high stakes, with high honors and place and power to the winner; and the winner is by no means necessarily the fit man to hold place or wield power; he may happen to be, but that isn't why he got the job; he got it because he was the best talker, or had more money to buy votes, or played on the feelings of the mob best, or for a great many other reasons, or collection of causes; but either inherent worth or evident fitness to serve the people are reasons for his being where he is that are more often conspicuous by their absence than by their presence. This being the case, they shove woman into this maelstrom of greed and graft, where the sternest fibres of strong men's souls are strained to the utmost to hold their own and come out unscathed?

"Her burdens are sufficient already. But, they say, that the injection of woman's keener sense of honor into this mess of corruption would miraculously and instantaneously purify it. Indeed! is, then, only the male of the species human? The females, I suppose, are divine, and immune to all corrupting influences; well, if so woman will have to make a new record for herself to prove it. I register my conviction right here that integrity has no sex; that temptation asails every soul, men and women alike; and while it is true that often a woman's perceptions are keener and her sense of honor more acute, it does not follow that she must take upon her shoulders ALL the burdens of earth.

"Why utilize these undeniably OFTEN but not ALWAYS superior gifts to put a nobler stamp on the child of to-day that will be the man of to-morrow? And to do vigorous police duty on the man of to-day? No great evil could long withstand the united onslaught of woman; and, knowing this, the men would keep a straighter course after a few jolts; the power behind the throne has ever been mighty and absolute. But women are not wielding it, more's the pity.

"God can raise up men if He wants them; every evil rights itself when it gets TOO bad, and any woman should be thankful that she need not go into the arena, but rather can raise the warriors, or strap their armor on and send them forth with stout hearts and clean hands to acquit themselves like men.

"To be a perfect wife and mother is such a high and holy calling, and takes such an infinite amount of the highest endowment and attainment of noble human qualities, that it seems to me a WOMANLY woman should feel in the deepest recesses of her being, in the holy of holies, where we reverence things, that THIS is her highest crown and glory, and that her power is only a little less than that of God himself. What greater power can she ask for than to hold in the hollow of hand, to mold as she will, for good or ill, a coming race?

"And if it be for ill, who is there to save her or her handiwork from the effects of her folly or her faithlessness?

"If God could only touch the blind eyes of woman, that they might see that they hold ALL power now if they would only use it!

With their God-appointed task fulfilled as it should be, public corruption would cease to be. The ballot can never correct public evil while the oncoming generations remain untrained in the ways of uprightness. Purify the stream at its source.

"In addition to the foregoing I would say that, somehow, in spite of the fact that I regard myself as a progressive, even to the point of being a radical, and that my independent spirit, born of fearless, open-minded thinking, must ever and always line up with the insurgents, the rebels, and even sometimes with the heretics, when the orthodox gets too hide-bound; and that of all things I should hate to be a moss-back, still, even with so many seemingly just and sound arguments to the effect that the average woman has just as much sense as the average man (which is so true that it is really no argument at all), and many other true things which are equally obvious, and being obvious I feel are beside the mark, yet—well, just the same I cannot eradicate the conviction that at my present stage of enlightenment is so firmly grounded that it appears to me basic, that after granting all the true things that have been put forward in favor of women voting, the one great objection to it looms above and swallows all these; and that is, it ought not to be necessary.

"Where are the men? Have we no men? The glory of a nation is the honor and sterling integrity of its men; and, though none can give womanhood a higher place than I do, there is something away back in my soul, I don't know what, that is bowed with a crushing sense of shame that any should declare that the men of my country are such a poor lot of sticks or scoundrels that the women, with all the rest of their burdens, have got to wrest the reins of government from them to save the country. I cannot acknowledge such a shameful thing; it is too humiliating.

"The men do make an awful botch of many things, but I refuse to admit that they are a total loss. We have got to have something to look up to, and since men are what we women make them, it behooves us to keep them up to the mark, not throw them out on the ash-heap while we do their work for them. In other words, it's like a man crawling under the bed while his wife grabs the ax and kills the bear; we know she can do it, that she has the grit to do it,

and that she WILL do it if she has to, but, oh! the shame of it if she does have to; shame for her, disgrace for him."

Women as Character-Builders

What is the greatest asset a nation can possess? Surely, it is the character of its people. To many observers it appears that ominous signs point to the deterioration of our national character, and since the formation of character is woman's special privilege and sphere, an inquiry as to whether she is at the present moment exercising this privilege, as she has done at some other periods of our history, and as she should do, may not be amiss.

On all sides we hear the clamors of the Suffragists, passionately urging the emancipation of their sex from what they are pleased to describe as a state of tyranny; and swept away by the waves of emotionalism which have engulfed many women, they unsex themselves and plead as an excuse for their wicked and foolish actions their pathetic belief in the power of the vote. This coveted morsel of political power is not a "right" at all, but a privilege, and one so little valued by many of its possessors that armies of canvassers issue forth to try and induce those who have the vote to exercise it; but the Suffragists are so obsessed with the notion of the potency of a vote that they appear to believe its possession would create a new earth. Is there any ground for such an assumption?

It is perfectly obvious that all women as women would not vote in one way, nor, if women were eligible for Parliament, that all women would vote for women candidates. The great body of sane women would still subordinate class and sex questions to the greater good of the whole. This is not mere assumption. An interesting article in the July number of the "Nineteenth Century" records the information, which the writer gathered during a visit to Finland, where women not only vote, but sit in Parliament, and though the time during which they have had these privileges is but short, there have been five general elections, with ample opportunities of seeing how the franchise works. The result is that women's votes are decreasing in numbers, and fewer women candidates are elected to Parliament.

If, then, the result of granting the Suffrage to women would be merely an increased number of votes, cast pretty much on present lines, why oppose it? Because, to many observers and thinkers, it appears to be connected with very serious and far-reaching evils.

Nature goes calmly on her way, whatever follies we commit, and Nature, having made "woman, not undeveloped man, but diverse," we cannot undo her work, even if we would.

The more delicate physical organization of women unfits them for much of the work men do, and, apparently, they cannot bear the nervous strain that the excitement of public life entails without risk of injury to themselves and the race. They become neurotic, hysterical, and unhinged, or if the injury does not proceed thus far or take this exact form, they develop other unlovely characteristics, due to the unnatural conditions of their environment. They are apt to become self-assertive and overbearing. Are these the qualities likely to render them successful in forming fine character? We think not. Those who form characters which are of value to their country and of use to their fellowmen, in which a necessary element is strength, must themselves be strong, disciplined to resist the sudden gusts of excitable feeling—in a word, self-controlled, knowing that violence is not strength. The outbreaks of unreasoning violence on the part of women which have taken place of late, in which they seemed to have lost all sense of proportion, have been distressing phenomena. If to such hands is committed the formation of a national character ,then, indeed, our national destruction will not be long delayed.

Another alarming symptom is the growing distaste for domestic life and its duties. On all sides we hear girls and young women express their dislike of and impatience with anything that interferes with their amusements or their complete personal freedom. This love of or demand for freedom leads on to the surprising acceptance by women of the destructive doctrines of Socialism and feminism, which mean the utter degradation of their sex.

We must recollect that the formation of character does not stop with childhood. We cannot draw the line at which a spirit may be touched to finer issues or be given a downward impulse. Women cannot divest themselves of their inherent privilege of influence. A very heavy responsibility rests with those older women who introduced young girls to the turbulent scenes which we have lately witnessed. If it is true that we "live by admiration, love, and hope," what can we say to those who inflame the youthful imagination—teach it to hate, to despise, and to dwell on morbid and unholy subjects?

The lack of balance is shown, and the lost sense of proportion evidenced, by the foolishly extraordinary actions that some Suffragists indulge in. What possible good is effected by a young and attractive woman neglecting her home to stand in the gutter selling newspapers against the wish of her husband? Women who forsake their plain duties for imaginary martyrdoms cannot possibly bring up sons who will be a strength to their country in her hour of need. The men who have made England great or served her well had mothers who were self-controlled, God-fearing, who thought of and taught duties, not rights. Take on instance alone, Sir Philip Sidney. He, who was the ideal of "the spacious times of great Elizabeth," by example and precept was taught by his mother to be what he was. How refreshing it is to read in these noisy, clamorous days of her as "supporting her husband and children through all trials with wise counsel and sweet, hopeful temper. . . . The perfect wife and mother, a lady of unpretending but heroic dignity."

Again, women who have no children to bring up are yet character-builders, for it should be remembered that it is women who set the standard of manners and morals. If they demand a high standard, men will rise to it—"If dougthy deeds my lady please," the doughty deeds will be wrought. If the women are without ideals, so will the men be.

New channels of opportunity for service have been opened to women in recent years, and men cordially welcome their co-operation. Co-operation—not rivalry, not railing— "Self-reverent each and reverencing each,
Distinct in individualities"
is the path along which true progress will proceed.

—English Anti-Suffrage Review.

JANE.

Jane was rude and independent,
Never paid a formal call,
Would not go to garden parties,
Loathed a tea-fight, shirked a ball;

Revelled in examinations,
Took degrees, ignored her looks,
Wore low heels (on number sevens),
Read most questionable books.

Finally went in for Suffrage—
Bit a poor policeman's nose.
Now she's doing time, and, later,
Hopes to lecture on her woes.

—Exchange.

HER REASONS.

"No, I don't want to vote!" declared a young woman while the vote for women question was discussed by a visitor. "It's something I'm thankful for. I don't care for that responsibility. Why the political subject gets warm up here in the country when we women folks are busy as bees with our Fall work. I wouldn't have time to vote for anyone, that is, to study up the subject. I should duplicate my husband's choice."

The visitor smiled wearily. "Could you not read up on political subjects?" ventured the visitor.

"Why I'm so tired after my work is done that I want something more entertaining."

"You could ask questions of your husband."

"Oh, he is tired and hungry and I am busy with him and the children. We don't feel like discussing things deep, just little chats that are about little things, but they interest us both."

THE TREND IN DENVER.

It is always of interest to note what is doing in Colorado, where the woman suffragists have made such strides and done things in such a practical way. "Practical" is the word, for we may note the trend of events from the viewpoint of the pre-election sentiments as far back as last Spring. Women were buzzing over the possible candidacy of Miss Gail Laughlin for the office of District Attorney in Denver. The Democratic women had their hands full with internecine strife, while the Equal Rights party, of mysterious membership, was holding secret, daily meetings. A political writer of the "Denver Republican" investigated the general situation and commented:

"The plan is to have women nominated for different offices on the different tickets and the combined vote of the women of Denver exerted to elect them. Everybody agrees that this is a beautiful plan, but the Democratic women and the Republican women and the Citizens' women all want the same offices. There is the office of Recorder. The Democratic women are making a fight to have one of their number nominated for this office. The Republican women want the office and so do the Citizens' women.

"It has been decided that the Recorder's job is the best plum the women could go after. No, it doesn't offer the incumbent opportunities to accomplish a great good for the community, the nation and the world, but think of the patronage! There isn't another office in the city and county with so much patronage.

" 'We want an office with patronage,' said one prominent woman yesterday afternoon. 'Of course, a woman can't do much as Recorder, but she'll have a lot of jobs to distribute. We women are tired of being given offices that have no patronage attached. How can a woman office-holder work up a personal following without patronage to give her workers? That we haven't had it before is the reason we are so weak in politics.

"The women would also like a supervisor or two and a member of the election commission. They will make a strong fight for the office of Secretary of State. Think of all the patronage in that job! 'We want offices where there are enough spoils to reward our workers,' is the new campaign cry of the suffragists of the State."

WOMAN SUFFRAGE VERSUS THE "WHITE SLAVE TRAFFIC."

Mr. Clarence S. Fairchild, in an addresc he delivered at Cazenovia, N. Y., in August, excerpts from which we reproduce, brought to the fore the topic of suffrage versus the so-called "white slave traffic." Mr. Fairchild's address was made at a public meeting in opposition to the extension of suffrage to women, held in the Cazenovia Town Hall. After opening the meeting, at which Mr. Fairchild presided, the speaker went on to say:

"I have been asked to say something regarding one matter. It is said women could do something about it, and that is that terrible thing called the 'White Slave Traffic.' That is something which, of course, excites our very deepest sympathy and indignation. I have just this to say about it. Is there any law upon the statute books of New York that is wrong? Is there any law anywhere (in the suffrage States, for instance), is there any law better than the law of the State of New York? If so, why not present it? It is unnecessary to wait for an amendment of our Constitution giving the right to vote to women, to attempt anything more, if anything more be possible, to check that evil. It is cruel to wait. Is there any method of administration of law which can be bettered? It seems to me that all the law that can be devised has been put in the statutes. Then it comes to the pure question of protection from violation of that law. That is a question of evidence. The great difficulty is getting the evidence. Woman does not need the ballot to help get the evidence on that subject and present it. That is enough to say on that subject. Nothing more could be said, it seems to me.

* * *

"One of the addresses at the suffrage meeting here on August 6 was interesting because of its misleading suggestions. The story of the growth of Democracy left it to be inferred that woman had not shared in its benefits. There was no suggestion of the women saints, scientists, poets, authors, scholars, philanthropists who have made the history of our race, so glorious, of the mothers of "the stormy brood of English blood who have filled the world with sails unfurled,' 'the roll of whose morning drum-beats continuous martial music around the world.'

"The obscure suggestion that there was something amiss with the inheritance and guardianship laws of this State, but no statement of exactly what and no evidence that any request to improve them had been made and been refused by the legislature.

"The implication that women could do more for the inmates of hospitals and asylums and for the schools if they had the vote, than they have been doing for years, and are doing now. The statement of poverty on the part of the Women Suffragists, when it is acknowledged that there are many of our wealthiest women among them, and many who now refuse all charitable gifts to devote all of their means to that cause. The story of two girls before the committee of the legislature, surprised to find it was composed of men only, men with votes, how they were confronted by men with votes. These poor little girls alone!

"No reference to the fact that the fifty-four hour appeal which they made had been made the law of the State. Another picture would have been far more true, representing those girls as two female Davids overcoming all of those bearded Goliaths. The hint that child-labor questions, playgrounds, etc., had taken a great start since women had got the vote in a few Western States—no hint that changed circumstances of labor and crowded cities had brought these subjects to the attention of both men and women, and that nothing on these subjects had come from any Woman Suffrage state, that they were last in these movements.

" 'What an emphasis on Life!' I presume that Life here means something like what used to be called Humanity. We have always been told that this Emphasis on Humanity—Life—if that is a better word, was the fruit of the thought expressed by the words, 'Do unto others as ye would they should do unto you.' 'Love thy neighbor as thyself,' 'Bear ye one another's burdens,' and many others.

"We have been taught that this fruit had come down the ages, healing the sick, binding their wounds, shielding the child, venerating woman, supporting the feet of the aged, making less harsh the operation of those inexorable laws of nature, supply and demand, and survival of the fittest. That this Humanity began when a Man died in Palestine now almost nineteen hundred years ago, and not when a woman got the vote in Wyoming and Utah thirty or forty years ago."

THINKING MADE THIS WOMAN WHAT SHE IS

The following letter, published in a Cleveland paper, touches upon a few reasons why woman should not "degenerate into a suffragist:

To the Editor of the "Leader."

Having read with interest the "Leader's" open forum for discussion of the question, "Shall the Women Have the Right to Vote?" I, as one of the leaders of those "opposed," in Canton, give my view on the question as it has been presented to the people in this place.

Mrs. Upton said the "antis" are a few self-satisfied women of wealth." Another suffrage speaker said, "They are women who do not do their own thinking." Now, it is that fatal word "thinking" that made me an "anti," and others have told me the same.

Many women declare for equal suffrage without looking into the matter for themselves, but being told "It is a moral duty," they accept it. Those women would vote in the same manner.

The most convincing argument against equal suffrage has been the contradictions made by the speakers. The wage question has been used to win supporters, when everyone should knows that supply and demand must settle that. Dr. Sumner, a suffragist writer, says in her book that equal suffrage cannot affect the pay of women. One speaker said the wages would be raised; another that minimum wage was all that could be expected. Mrs. Avery, a suffragist speaker, said, "There are just enough anti-suffragists to make a petticoat for the liquor traffic." While Mrs. Eastman was in New York telling the brewers she welcomed their support, Mayor Baker, of Cleveland, was here to form a men's league, and told the women the liquor traffic could not be overcome by equal suffrage.

The "white slave traffic" has been an issue. Jane Addams says the majority of girls who go astray come from the domestic service. No need for the ballot to overcome that. It is at our very door.

The question of women property owners paying taxes and not having a vote is a foolish and selfish argument. Women only own about one-tenth of the property in this country. Do men like to pay taxes any better than women? Have women not the same protection as men? Are these taxes not used for the benefit of humanity? The tax question is the rich woman's personal reason.

Now came to Canton the "militant suffragist." She announced she had come to fight. She delivered addresses to men while in the water at Myers Lake, in bathing suit attire, challenging them to say why women should not vote. Then she went to the anti-suffrage meeting, disturbing the speaker, and trying to deliver an address, when people were told to ask questions. At last she was ordered from the building.

Many are the reasons for being an "anti," but greatest of all is, "Why does the American woman, who has the best position in the world want to degenerate into a suffragist?" Women have accomplished so much without the ballot! Let them solve the problems that arise in their own households, then reach out and help the women who do not know how to solve such problems; thus helping to bring into this nation honest, upright sons and daughters. Then the question of voting will be solved, and not until then.

If women are given the ballot now conditions will be no better. We must make men and women better; beginning with the children. This should be the work for women, and they only can do it.

One suffragist speaker said the men have made a failure of politics. So every man who votes for equal suffrage on the third of September, acknowledges himself a failure. Is it possible that the father will not vote for men who will frame laws to protect those for whom he has labored so long and faithfully? Let us trust him to stand at the helm, we helping in many ways.

MRS. RAY J. BOUR.

Canton, O.

WHAT A SUFFRAGIST SAYS OF OHIO VOTERS

Returning from a ten weeks' suffrage campaign in Ohio, Miss Elizabeth Freeman, the English militant suffragette, who served a term in Holloway jail, declared that nothing could torture the soul of the ardent suffragette like the "colossal stinginess of the Ohio farmer." "It was a real hardship campaigning in Ohio," continued Miss Freeman. "In the town and villages the Ohio farmer looked upon us with suspicious eyes and asked if we weren't afraid to be tramping about the country alone, and in our long campaign I can only recall six instances when we were greeted with any show of genuine hospitality. We made nearly 200 speeches and visited 112 towns. In a few of the towns we met with hotel managers who would not put us up for the night. They regarded us with suspicion. English women have a great deal more liberty and they don't boast of it."—Indianapolis Sun.

IF IDAHO WOMEN WIN

(From the Chicago Inter-Ocean.)

A Republican ticket made up entirely of woman candidates will be placed in the field in Idaho this fall against the regular Republican and Progressive tickets, according to a despatch from Boise City. The reason given for the move is that the woman Republicans have become disgusted with the wrangling that has been going on within the party.

Of course the woman's ticket will not win. But just suppose that it should! Suppose that the united women of Idaho should put women into all the offices from governor down to sheriff and constable! What an illuminating "reductio ad absurdum" of the entire woman suffrage contention we should soon have!

The first time a woman sheriff called on the "posse comitatus" to help apprehend a desperate criminal and was answered by the men, the only persons capable of answering such a call or executing such a commission, the essential fact that force is the real basis and support of organized government would be made clear.

The first time a woman governor called on the armed power of the state to maintain order in some turbulent district where life and property were endangered, and the call was answered by bodies capable of maintaining the sovereign power of the state in face of disorder, the fact that government, in the last analysis, is organized force would receive needed emphasis.

In brief, every time an occasion arose for the assertion of the sovereign power of the Commonwealth in the only way in which it can be asserted in extreme cases, whether the case be the execution of the mandate of a court or the suppression of rebellion within its borders, the men would have to assert it, or it would have to go unasserted.

And assume, for the sage of argument, that an occasion should arise when the united women officials of Idaho wished the power of the state to be effectively asserted through its

agents in some particular direction, and the united men of the state wished it not to be, which side would prevail—the nominal government or the real force which is the basis of effective government?

HUNGARIANS WOMEN'S VOTE.

Frankly Admitted That Authorities Will Be Able to Influence Their Ballots.

Buda-Pesth, Sept. 14.—Feminists are full of joyful anticipation because of the reports that the new franchise bill will admit certain qualified women to vote in parliamentary elections.

According to rumor the proposal will be to admit those women who are economically independent—who run their own property or business or who have passed the higher state examinations.

It is estimated that there are about 180,000 such women in Hungary, but as they are mostly employed as government servants in public offices or schools the critics of the government declare the concession will be more apparent than real, since the authorities will be able to exercise such pressure as to deprive women voters of an independent choice.

EQUAL PUNISHMENT, TOO

Magistrate Murphy delivered himself of one of his particular views on suffrage in deciding the case of Miss Stella Schneider against Mrs. Gabrielle Morelli and Miss Kate Morelli in the Tombs court. A row occurred over Mrs. Morelli's seven-year-old son, and the two women set on Miss Schneider and beat her, it was alleged.

"Women who fight in the street must expect to receive the same punishment as men who fight in the street," said the magistrate. "Women want equal rights with men, but you haven't any respect for the courts. As soon as you appear in court you expect to be released without penalty. You consider it as a sort of entertainment for your benefit. You want to vote and have men's privileges, but not their punishments. But I am going to hold you each in $300 bail for your good behavior."

Neither of the Morellis could furnish bail and both went to prison.—N. Y. Tribune.

JOKE ON FEMINISTS

A dispatch from Vienna to the New York Sun says the Austrian minister of education seems to have a sense of humor. For some time, the dispatch continues, he has been harassed by the feminists to extend the curriculum in girls' schools so that women may be able to compete on equal terms with men for government and other clerkships.

At last their request has been granted, but with the stipulation that any girl taking up modern languages or other "extra" subjects shall be compelled to add cookery to her school course.

The feminists have issued a furious protest against this insidious attempt to domesticate their sex, but the Minister remains firm. Up to now cookery has never been taught in Austrian government schools, but classes are to be established wherever practicable.

In order to carry out this innovation as cheaply as possible it has been decided to run restaurants in connection with the classes, in which the menus are to be drawn on a novel plan, the prices of the dishes being graduated according to whether they were prepared by elementary or advanced pupils.

THE WARNING IN WALES.

(From the English Anti-Suffrage Review.)

"The courageous manner in which Women Suffragists were treated by the mob . . . at Wrexham must have a very lasting effect." Thus Votes for Women. And since Wrexham, has come Llanystumdwy. We earnestly pray that the effect upon Suffragists may, indeed, be lasting; that the lesson learnt at these two places may not easily be forgotten by them. They are slow to learn. "Drunk with sight of power," the delicate sense of perception by which women may read danger signals is lost. Their vision is so blurred that what those who run may read has no meaning for them. Once before, on the occasion which Suffragists refer to as "Black Friday," it was brought forcibly home to these women what their fate may be at the hands of men from whom provocation has released the restraints of civilized life. How many more times must this thing happen, while the dignity and the modesty of womanhood is being trampled in the dust?

It is to us, the others, that these women will have to answer, when insult and abominations from which we were once immune by virtue of our sex reign in the place of chivalry and restraint. Every time women are roughly handled by a mob of men, man himself slips back one step in the march towards that by which alone woman can come into her own. Men of themselves would never seek to demolish the barriers which social custom has erected round the other sex, for it is more to men's advantage even than to women's that the sanctity of the latter should not be betrayed. When, therefore, it is thus betrayed, it is not the men we hold accountable. "Woe unto him by whom offence cometh." The blame and the shame for the disgraceful scenes at Wrexham lie with those presumably educated and enlightened women, not with the rough uncontrolled mob whose passions they provoked.

The action of the Suffragists in this case was inexcusable. They bore down upon the National Festival of a quick-tempered and passionate people, whose nationality is their very religion; and they attempted to make, indeed, succeeded in making a farce and a fiasco of these almost sacred proceedings. Their own excuse for this senseless conduct is that breaking up other people's meetings is one way of expressing their disapproval of men's treatment of them. Well, the Welshmen turned upon them, roused by this interference to fury and violence, which was their way of expressing their disapproval of Suffragettes.

Accounts that have come in of what happened contain, according to the Suffragists' paper, hints of indecencies and indignities which are said to be unmentionable. . . . When will Suffragettes face the fact that Woman is not Man? They cannot thus dare and rouse the brute in man without taking shame and humiliation to their hearts. Let them seek "martyrdom" for themselves, if they will, in their own way; but let them beware how they open the floodgates of man's violence upon their sex. Once these are opened nothing can stem the tide by which all women must be overtaken.

The war of wits between man and woman is a fair war, in which women more often than not have the advantage. But to put their persons in the way of being handled by men, and handled with violence by "any" sort of men can only bring results disastrous to the aims they advertise and demoralizing and degrading to men. Both sexes are equally dishonored by orgies of this kind. For the brute in man cannot be uncovered without exposing the serpent in woman who tempts him to his own undoing.

Suffragists have had warning of what it may mean when man says, "Thou art woman to me no longer."

LEONORA LOCKHART.

We presume the proposal to subject German girls to compulsory military service is to protect the Kaiser's empire from invasion by militant British suffragettes.

Notes and Comment

Miss Inez Milholland is one of the most militant of American suffragists. She is reported to have said, in commenting on the recent lawlessness of the English suffragettes:

"No, the present demonstrations in England are not hysterical. They are perfectly calm and deliberately planned. The suffragettes of England have realized their fight must be won by revolution and their demonstrations are justified.

* * *

The patriarch of Venice has said: "The present up-to-date fashions are not merely an expression of a woman's inborn vanity, but rather of her natural inclination to sin. Is it not embarassing and revolting to see these scantily clad women appearing in public? What do these provoking stares and these loose manners mean but that the sentiment of modesty has disappeared? I do not believe that I am exaggerating when I say that creatures who dress as shockingly as many do to-day are in a permanent state of sin."

The Venetian newspapers, in commenting on the homily, have added force to the rising tide of feminine indignation by upholding the Patriarch's contention in the strongest terms.

The Italian feminists retort by saying that the attitude of the Church, as represented by the Patriarch, is only another episode of man's fight against woman's emancipation, and that the new styles and the determination of women to wear them in spite of masculine counsels, are both a new way of asserting woman's desire to be the equal of man, whose mode of dressing she has never challenged, and a new weapon in the hands of woman in her struggle for independence.

* * *

It appears that women can mark their ballots correctly and expeditiously; that they can act capably as election officials and that they can work harmoniously with men. Neither fears nor doubts on this head had perturbed the human mind. The vital question is: What new element, what virtue or demerit, what weakness or strength, accompanies votes by women? The California election proves nothing.—Public Ledger, Philadelphia.

* * *

I talked to the French dressmakers here on the Feminist movement and was glad to find them utterly scornful of suffrage—although they are capable women as most French women are. They held that a woman should be practical and helpful in all ways and should understand social conditions, etc., but go ino politics on her own account, "Mai, foi! non, what will become of the women's work then?" They said that France is suffering now from too many clever workers. Conditions are such that women are forced to work but the results are bad all round, and now that the religious orders have been driven out the children are no longer cared for while the mothers are away. Is it any wonder that M. Briand has had to appoint a commission to inquire into the steady increase in crime?—Extract from Letter of Mrs. Julia Waterman, from Paris.

* * *

The militant Suffragettes (writes a Scottish correspondent of the London "Observer") are nothing if not inventive. Tired of attacking Mr. Winston Churchill with dog-whips and umbrellas, one of these enterprising ladies last week devised a new weapon of offense. Approaching him on the golf links in the vicinity of Balmoral with apparently empty hands—no unknown woman armed with a stick or umbrella is allowed by the detectives to come within striking distance—she suddenly threw a large worm in his face.

* * *

A lady friend of ours, (yes, lady, for she has not yet voted but wants to) when asked why she didn't vote the school ticket if she was so anxious to be a voter, remarked, "No I want the whole or none." Poor logic, if there is any depth to the ambition. A starving person would hardly refuse bread because there was an abundance of corn beef and cabbage on the table and he was not invited to partake of that. A person looking for salvation catches at straws.—Shore Line Times, Guilford, Conn.

* * *

The announcement that English suffragettes who attempt to enter Canada will be excluded from the country as undesirables ought not to be interpreted as a slap at equal suffrage. The suffragettes planning to invade the Dominion do not intend to appear as peaceful propagandists observing the amenities of civilized life. They intend to enter as trouble-makers, as destroyers of property and inciters to violence. They have themselves conveyed this information through threats made to Premier Borden when he was in England. The Canadian government is wise in excluding them, just as it would be wise in excluding a band of bomb-throwing anarchists that might attempt to force its way past the immigration officials. Recent happenings in Ireland indicate that the methods of the suffragettes and the methods of the anarchists are not very far apart.—Detroit Free Press.

SUFFRAGE OPINIONS

Frances Wayne, Sept. 8, 1912.

That woman has been willingly servile is proved by the long stunting of her intellectual growth. As Ceciley Hamilton says: "Her morality, like her stupidity, has been imposed on her."

Along with the color of her hair, the cut of her features, the quality of her disposition, woman inherits her "privileges." These consist, as catalogued by Ceciley Hamilton, of:

"1. The right to wear on the third finger of the left hand a gold ring of approved but somewhat monotonous pattern.

2. The right to walk into dinner in advance of women unfurnished with a gold ring of the approved monotonous pattern.

"3. The right of the wife and mother to pursue openly in the drawing room certain forms of literature—such as French novels of an erotic type—which the ordinary unmarried woman is supposed to read in the seclusion of her bedroom."

Letter to the London Standard, April 22, 1912.

Sir:—I am the wife of a clergyman, and I have just signed the "Suffragist Churchwoman's Protest," and have thereby undertaken not to attend any church, do any work, or contribute any money in any parish where the parish priest is not in sympathy with the women's movement." Thousands of my sisters are, I hope, doing the same.

I believe in all countries where women have the vote the "white slave traffic" is unknown except in name. I may add I have my husband's fullest approval of this method of protest against the apathy of our Church leaders. (Mrs.) AMY G. EXTON.

Mrs. James M. Teller, of Denver, Sept. 8, 1912.

To be sure, I think the position of woman is affecting the manners of men. Why should they be bending their energies to help care for women who show a desire and tendency to help and care for themselves. It is woman's right as well as her privilege to be dandled and loved and told she is a baby doll. And, seeing this type of women forced to the background I wonder regretfully if we are coming to the Amazonian days again when men will be our playthings.

Take the increased physical development of woman—that's a clear sign that the old order is changing and that we are not going to remain any longer than we must on the equality toward which we are striving once we attain it. We're going to push forward and leave the men behind.

The New York State Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

FOUNDED 1895

PAMPHLETS

Woman and the Law — *By Francis M. Scott*

Address Before Constitutional Convention, 1894 — *By Hon. Elihu Root*

First Address Before the New York Legislature, 1895 — *By Mrs. Francis M. Scott*

The Problem of Woman Suffrage — *By Adeline Knapp*

Woman's Rights in America — *By Mrs. Caroline F. Corbin*

A Talk to Women on the Suffrage Question — *By Miss Emily P. Bissell*

Wages and the Ballot — *By Mary Dean Adams*

Should We Ask for the Suffrage? — *By Mrs. Schuyler Van Rensselaer*

How Women Can Best Serve the State — *By Mrs. Barclay Hazard*

The Blank Cartridge Ballot — *By Rossiter Johnson*

Taxation and Suffrage — *By Frederick Dwight*

Real Opponents to the Suffrage Movement — *By Edward W. Bok*

The Relation of the Sexes to Government — *By Prof. Edward D. Cope*

Do Working Women Need the Ballot? — *By Adeline Knapp*

Woman's Progress Versus Woman Suffrage — *By Helen Kendrick Johnson*

What Women Have Actually Done Where they Vote — *By Richard Barry*

Woman's Relation to Government — *By Mrs. William Forse Scott*

The Inexpediency of Granting Suffrage to American Women — *By Miss Alice Hill Chittenden*

The Legal Status of Women — *By Mrs. Francis M. Scott*

Feminism — *By Prof. Dr. Melchior Palagyi*

Woman Suffrage and Child Labor Legislation — *By Miss Minnie Bronson*

Woman Suffrage in Finland

New Zealand and Australia from an Anti-Suffrage Point of View

The Voice of the People

Suffragists Desert Philanthropy

Woman Suffrage and the Equal Guardianship Law

Printed matter can be secured by application to the Secretary at the office of the Association, 29 West 39th Street, New York City, Engineering Societies Building.

Complete set 50 cts. Single copies 5 cts.

BOOKS RECOMMENDED FOR READING

On Suffrage (0.5) — *G. K. Chesterton*

Votes for Women (.10) — *Frederic Harrison*

The Ladies Battle ($1.00) — *Molly Elliot Seawell*

Book of Woman's Power ($1.25)

Anti-Suffrage: Ten Good Reason (50c.) — *Grace Duffield Goodwin*

Woman and the Republic (25c.) — *Mrs. Rossiter Johnson*

Anti-Suffrage Calendar for 1911, with many interesting quotations. These can be obtained by applying to the Woman's Protest.

We recommend to our readers the new Monthly, THE COMMON CAUSE, which is opposed to Socialism. Subscription $2.00. Office, 154 East 23rd Street. Also, THE HOME DEFENDER, Hoquiam, Wash.

Some pamphlets issued by the Massachusetts Association opposed to the further extension of suffrage to women:

Some of the Reasons Against Woman Suffrage — *Francis Parkman*

Of What Benefit to Woman?

Why I Am Opposed to Woman Suffrage — *Jeannette L. Gilder*

Letter to Legislative Committee — *Mrs. Clara T. Leonard*

Argument Before Committee — *Mrs. Kate Gannett Wells*

Municipal Suffrage for Women. Why? — *Frank Foxcraft*

Taxpaying Suffrage — *Charles R. Saunders*

The Wage-earning Woman and the State — *Minnie Bronson*

Rights and Exemptions Given by Massachusetts Law to Women and Not to Men

Opinions of Eminent Persons Against Woman Suffrage

In Opposition to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women (a List of Massachusetts Men)

Woman's Power and Woman Suffrage — *Ida M. Tarbell*

Pamphlets and Leaflets may be obtained from the Secretary of the Association

KENSINGTON BUILDING, Room 615
687 Boylston Street, - - - BOSTON, MASS.

The Woman's Protest

.....1912

The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage
29 West 39th Street, New York City

Enclosed find $.....for.....year's subscription for The Woman's Protest.

Name.....

Street.....

City.....State.....

Subscription Rate $1.00 a year Make checks payable to The Woman's Protest

Manager of Boxing Club Doesn't Want Woman Suffrage Show.

Mrs. Gus Ruhlin, widow of the late Gus Ruhlin, saloon keeper and one-time heavyweight boxer, called on the promoters of the Royal A. C. Saturday night in an endeavor to secure the Clermont avenue rink, in which she purposed staging a few boxing bouts in connection with a combined Progressive and women's suffrage rally. After quite an extended interview with Charley Doesserick, manager of the club, Mrs. Ruhlin left with the knowledge that she would be unable to retain the arena for any such purpose.

According to Doesserick, who judged Mrs. Ruhlin's efforts from the boxing standpoint, an affair of this kind would bring unenviable notoriety to the sport.—Brooklyn Citizen.